



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,224	12/20/2001	Takashi Katsumata	11-076	4216
23400	7590	04/05/2005	EXAMINER	
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC 12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE SUITE 101 RESTON, VA 20191			HANLEY, JOHN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2856	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

78

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/022,224		KATSUMATA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	John C. Hanley		2856	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/6/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 - 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the shield substrate and/or shield frame must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The elements "shield substrate" and "shield frame" are not named in the specification to support such elements of the same language in the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2856

Claim Objections

3. First, applicant has not fully responded to the objection made in paragraph 1 of the prior office action regarding the use of the term drive signal instead of drive force. For example, in claim 1 there is recited "an input electrode for inputting a periodical signal from said external circuit to said movable portion." As this is clearly an electrical signal, and the movable portion is insulation from the electrodes, this is not possible.

4. "Comprising" is used instead of a term such as "including" in several instances. For example, in claims 28, 30 and 31, "said movable portion comprises and electrode" is not accurate because it includes more than an electrode.

5. Regarding claims 23, 32, 35 and 38, for example, the elements are in a plane rather than on a plane.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not mention a shield substrate or shield frame element. Thus, it does not teach one how to make and use the invention.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2856

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the shield substrate and/or the shield frame are in all of the claims. It is made further unclear by the unclear by claiming other substrates like the fixed substrate in the same plane as the other substrates, rendering unclear whether the shield substrate or frame is the same as a previously recited substrate. This is made further questionable because in some claims, applicant states that the shield wire brings the shield substrate to the same potential as the shield wire, ruling out the assumption that the shield substrate or frame are the same as the frame 20 disclosed, because the frame 20 is disclosed as being insulated from the shield wire/pad. It is confusing whether or not the shield substrate is the same as the fixed substrate, or an element thereof. For example, in claim 7, a shield substrate is recited, and later, a pad is recited as connected to said shield wire on said fixed portion. In claims 1 and 17, for example, there is no antecedent basis for "said shield frame" and "said shield substrate", rendering it further unclear if this elements are the same elements as other elements recited, or different elements. Further, in claim 34, the shield substrate is recited as comprising a frame, which confuses the issue of whether or not the shield frame, the shield substrate, and the fixed portion of the substrate previously recited are the same or different elements. Further, in claim 23, the connecting means is connected to the shield substrate instead of the plate 90, as disclosed.

Art Unit: 2856

10. The language of the next to last clause in each of claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 20, 23, 32 and 35 is so confusing that it can't be interpreted. The mixture of functional statements and structural elements makes unclear what element is doing which function and which elements are connected to which other elements. This is complicated by the sentence arrangement of elements and general sentence structure. For example, in claim 1, the claim reads as the shield wire is on the shield substrate rather than the pad on the substrate. The clause having electrical insulation to shield said output wire is unclear where the insulation is, and how the insulation affects shielding. The phrase "and to supply" is not clear what supplies.

11. Because the claims cannot be properly interpreted, and applicant uses the new terminology that cannot be interpreted in his arguments to traverse the art previously applied, the examiner is not attempting a rejection on prior art. The examiner notes, however, that applicant's argument that a shield is placed between elements to be shielded from one another is common knowledge to one of ordinary skill in the art who desires to reduce crosstalk between elements; and that the act of placing a shield between two elements a predetermined distance to the elements to be shielded is inherent in the decision to use a shield.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a

Art Unit: 2856

first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John C. Hanley whose telephone number is 571-272-2195. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on 571-272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCH




HEZRON WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800